

REMARKS

Claims 21-36 are pending. Claims 21-33 have been amended. New claims 34-36 have been added.

Claims 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,428,885 (Takaya et al.).

Claim 21 has been amended to recite a mounting board on which a plurality of conductive patterns are formed and a hybrid integrated circuit disposed on the mounting board. The hybrid integrated circuit includes at least one conductive path. An insulating film is selectively formed on the rear surface of the at least one conductive path so that at least one of the conductive patterns on the mounting board is insulated from the at least one conductive path.

Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in FIGs. 1, 2, 3A and 9A. No new matter has been added. As shown in the example of FIG. 3A, a plurality of conductive patterns 21B, 21E are formed on a mounting board 10. A hybrid integrated circuit 13 is disposed on the mounting board 10 and incorporates conductive paths 51A, 51B, 51C. (*See* FIG. 1, FIG. 2 and FIG. 3A) In FIG. 9A, an insulating film RF is selectively formed on a rear surface of the conductive paths 51A, 51B, 51C. Referring again to FIG. 3A, a conductive pattern 21B located on a top part of the mounting board 10 is insulated from the conductive path 51B by an insulating film RF. By incorporating the features recited in claim 21, a circuit device may advantageously include a conductive pattern on a mounting board 10 that extends across a rear surface of a semiconductor device 53A without contacting a conductive path 51A, 51B, 51C on the semiconductor device. (*See* page 28, lines 22-24)

The Takaya et al. patent fails to teach or suggest a hybrid integrated circuit disposed on a mounting board that has multiple conductive patterns formed thereupon, where the hybrid integrated circuit includes a conductive path and *where an insulating film is selectively formed on a rear surface of a conductive path to insulate that conductive path from at least one of the conductive patterns*, as recited in claim 21. Instead, the Takaya et al. patent discloses components 2 positioned above a laminated body 1D. (*See* FIG. 4) A surface pattern 10 is

exposed at an upper surface of the laminated body 1D. The components 2 include pins 12 that couple directly to the surface pattern 10.

The Takaya et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests an insulating film selectively formed on a rear surface of the pins 2 to insulate the pins 2 from the surface pattern 10.

Claim 21 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 22-26 depend from claim 21 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 27-32 also were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Takaya et al. patent.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite features that are similar to those features discussed above with reference to claim 21. Claim 27, therefore should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claims 28-32 depend from claim 27 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Claim 33 also was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the Takaya et al. patent.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite features that are similar to those features discussed above with reference to claim 21. Claim 33, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

New claims 34-36 depend from claim 21. New claims 34-36, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21, discussed above.

Applicant : Noriaki Sakamoto et al.
Serial No. : 10/622,997
Filed : July 18, 2003
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-072002 / F51-
160152M/SW

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/14/05



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291